



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

heaped upon poor Alger and other mortals. In Spain the course of thought has been the same. Calamities have come from men; but if success had attended the Spanish arms, if they had destroyed American fleets and defeated American armies, *Te Deums* would have resounded in all the churches and cathedrals.

We are not irreverent. We believe profoundly in God's providence. We believe in his perpetual interests in the affairs of men, bad as well as good. Not a soldier falls in any battle, not a ship is sunk in any sea, not a battle cruel and bloody is fought anywhere, without his notice. He is forever seeking to promote human good, and does promote it wherever and so far as men will let him or coöperate with him; often in spite of them. He makes good seemingly come out of evil, though in reality it always comes out of himself. But that interpretation of God's providence and interposition which makes him take sides directly in battle, with its cruelties and horrors and sufferings, like selfish, glory-seeking, vindictive mortals, upholding "our side" and ruthlessly crushing the enemy, is unworthy of any sane mind; it is outrageous; it is blasphemous. It is as complete a denial of God as he is fully revealed to us in Jesus Christ as it is possible to conceive. It degrades his character to the lowest level of passion, and makes him unworthy of respect, to say nothing of worship and love.

Government and Force.

On another page, under "Correspondence," we publish a letter from Dr. J. C. Barnes of Hindsboro, Illinois, in which is found some pretty vigorous and independent thinking, whatever may be thought of the soundness of some of its conclusions or premises. The question which he discusses, with such evident purpose to do his duty after finding it,—the question of coercive government in its relation to individual freedom and rights,—is confessedly one of the most difficult in the whole range of morals. Everybody who thinks at all thinks upon it, and must think upon it. We have space for only a brief consideration of the subject in its fundamental aspects.

The theory that government is founded on force, or on a principle which involves the use of force as a necessary adjunct of its administration, seems to us to be radically defective. If this theory be true, then either war with all its immoralities and inhumanities must be accepted as right under possible contingencies, or government itself must be rejected as essentially wrong. This latter position Mr. Barnes, in his moral rejection of war, seems to take. But a man who takes this position cannot consistently hold property titles of any kind under the government, nor pay taxes, nor vote, nor make any even moral efforts to support government laws of

any kind, nor use money regulated by government. In the present organization of society, such a man, if loyal to his principles, would become at once an object of charity and live only so long as others fed and clothed him. It is doubtful if he could conscientiously even accept food and clothing from those living under government regulations. Few good people would be willing to carry their "anarchism," their opposition to government that is, to these logical consequences. Such persons live necessarily with more or less inconsistency; against their wish, to be sure. On the other hand, a considerable number of persons, who accept the position that government is legitimate but that it is founded in force or necessarily involves the use of force, reject war as always wrong. Their moral nature revolts against it, though the acceptance of it as legitimate necessarily follows from their premises. They too live in real inconsistency, puzzled often to know how to make their consciences and their heads harmonize.

Government is founded in the necessities of orderly, harmonious coöperation of groups of individuals for the accomplishments of ends not attainable by individual effort. Wherever two men coöperate in the performance of a task, government in its essential nature begins, one taking the lead and directing, or first one and then the other doing this. As the groups of coöperating individuals grow larger and their mutual enterprises more complex, the necessity of guidance, direction, leadership becomes more imperative. In the movements of small groups the government of the body, which inheres fundamentally and always in the body itself, works itself out nearly instinctively with little or no organization, but in larger groups spreading over extended territories organization of the direction and guidance, of the planning and collective execution, becomes necessary. Thus develop town, county, state and national organized governments, for the creation and maintenance of public roads, the determination of the mutual relations of property, the promotion of education, the care of the needy, the conveyance of mails, etc., etc.

This we believe to be the true origin and necessity of government. It is clear therefore that governments would have existed, if there had never been any tyrants or usurpers, or any wicked men to be restrained, and that they will continue to exist after all the abuses of the heads of states cease and all men become possessed of love and goodwill, and the use of force becomes unknown.

On this theory of government, men who oppose war, or any other evil which the constituted authorities enter into, can nevertheless consistently take part in the support of the government in the performance of its legitimate functions. Indeed, they are under the most solemn obligation, as members of the coöperating body of citizens, to do so. Abuse and perversion of its functions does not vitiate

government as a whole. The abuses are to be faithfully opposed. Obedience is to stop whenever it means submission to wrong. But the natural and just functions are to be entered into and supported with whole-hearted devotion. Only in this way can good men ever redeem the governments of the world from the corruptions, the usurpations, the tyrannies into which they have fallen.

The idea of coercion in government arose from two sources, the presence of wicked, ambitious men in the seats of government, and the presence of evil-doers in society. It is perfectly clear that all the coercion of good men and the trampling on their rights and liberties by wicked rulers is wrong. It is equally clear that governments ought to allow liberty of conscience to really good men who in general are faithful citizens but who cannot conscientiously perform certain services which the authorities think right to impose. Only in this way can organized government and real liberty exist together. The government exists for the people, not the people for the government, and it is much more important that the real rights and liberties of the people be preserved than that the government should be saved at times from seeming disrespect. The disobedience of a good citizen to what he believes to be unrighteous demands strengthens rather than weakens the real authority of government, because it tends to bring out that authority and clearly define it.

The restraint of evil-doers raises the real difficulty of the question. The commonly accepted opinion is that in their restraint force may be used even to the taking of life. This position involves of course theoretically the lawfulness of war in some form, in possible cases of suppression of organized rebellion and of self-defense against outside aggression. Even if this position were correct, governments would still be under obligation to use every possible peaceful means before resorting to the death of individuals or to war, and those composed of men of real love and goodwill would doubtless succeed in most cases in avoiding forceful coercion. The danger of the position is that if deadly force is accepted as lawful the resort to it is so easy and its abuse so natural that all other considerations are quickly swept away. It is very difficult if not impossible for love to remain love while one is smiting down or preparing to smite down with deadly force one's fellowmen, even evil-doers.

Is it possible to restrain successfully transgressors without the use of deadly force? There is a considerable number of persons—and the number is rapidly increasing—who believe that pure, intelligent love and goodwill like that of Jesus Christ can never go to war nor do the deeds of war. These hold that a government conducted on the principles of the Sermon on the Mount is the only possible Christian or really human one, and that such a

government could maintain its authority and more effectually restrain evil-doers, both within and without, than any government arming itself with deadly weapons. This position theoretically is clearly much more in harmony with the principles both of Christianity and humanity than the other. Is it practical? Its advocates think so. The only experiment of the kind ever tried, that of William Penn, gives strong ground for their belief. To try the experiment successfully on an extended scale, it would be necessary for practically the whole body of a people to be convinced of the rightness and the practicability of it and to throw themselves along with their government into the experiment, with entire faith.

It is certain that as Christian civilization advances all governments will, in practice, approach nearer and nearer to the ideal administration of such a government. Those who believe in discarding deadly weapons, both in individual and governmental life, and in overcoming evil only with good, have very high grounds for their position. They certainly have no reason to be ashamed of their convictions, nor of faithfully trying to live them out before men. The future—of this world we mean—is theirs beyond question.

Editorial Notes.

The International Peace Congress which was to have opened at Lisbon on the 3d inst has been put off for this year. Lisbon was chosen for the Congress, because the Interparliamentary Peace Union had decided to hold its annual conference there, though many objected to the city because of its remoteness from the centers of activity of the European peace societies. After the decision not to hold the Interparliamentary Conference this year, and the discovery that but small reduction in rates of travel could be obtained, the Peace Bureau at Berne, after consultation with the Peace Society at Lisbon and other societies, came to the conclusion that it was wisest to give up the Congress for this year. In some respects it is to be regretted that the Congress cannot meet at this important time, but the action taken is doubtless wisest in view of the probable smallness of the number who would have attended. There are many members, though not a majority, of the Congress who believe that a meeting every two years would accomplish just as much as annual meetings. In view of the decision to put off the Congress till next year, it was decided to have the General Meeting of the Peace Bureau Organization take place at Turin, Italy, on the 26th of September, the 100th anniversary of the birth of Count Sclopis, and to give to the program an importance which it would otherwise not have had. This meeting has taken place, and will, we trust, have done much to strengthen the peace movement in Italy, where it has already made remarkable progress.